Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 270 Filed 01/12/12 Page 1 of 5

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 261 Filed 01/10/12 Page 1 of 6 Page ID#: 2831

J. Randolph Pickett, OSB #721974 randy@pickettlaw.com R. Brendan Dummigan, OSB #932588 brendan@pickettlaw.com Kristen West, OSB #061380 kristen@pickettlaw.com

PICKETT DUMMIGAN LLP

621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 900 Portland, OR 97205-3823 Telephone: (503) 226-3628 Facsimile: (503) 227-2530

Roger K. Evans, OSB #812170 roger@rogerkevans.com LAW OFFICE OF ROGER K. EVANS 675 Church St., NE Salem, OR 97301-2402

Telephone: (503) 585-2121 Facsimile: (503) 364-7689

of Attorneys for Plaintiff Robbie D. Bispo

Thomas R. Merrick, WSBA #10945 tmerrick@mhlseattle.com

MERRIČK, HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S.

3101 Western Avenue, Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98121 Telephone: 206-682-0610

Fax: 206-467-2689

Thomas W. Brown, OSB #801779 tbrown@cosgravelaw.com Timothy J. Coleman, OSB#84197 tcoleman@cosgravelaw.com

COSGRAVE VERGEER KESTER LLP

500 Pioneer Tower 888 SW Fifth Avenue Portland, OR 97204 Telephone: (509) 323-9000

Fax: 503-323-9019

of Attorneys for Defendant Robertshaw Controls Company

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON- PORTLAND DIVISION

ROBBIE D. BISPO,)
Plaintiff,) No. 3:05-cv-01223-BR
V.) CTIDULATION OF BARTIES
ROBERTSHAW CONTROLS COMPANY,) STIPULATION OF PARTIES) REGARDING JOINT PROPOSED) MOTION SCHEDULE
Defendant.) MOTION SCHEDOEL

T. RECITAL

Pursuant to the Court's Order requiring submission of a proposed joint motion schedule for all matters that the parties sought to have the Court resolve prior to trial, the parties exchanged drafts of proposed motions and subject matter prior to the Court's submission deadline. In discussion and agreement between counsel, the following motions and issues have been stipulated and agreed:

MERRICK, HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW 3101 Western Ave. Suite 200 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121 (206) 682-0610

STIPULATION OF PARTIES REGARDING JOINT PROPOSED MOTION SCHEDULE - Page 1

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 270 Filed 01/12/12

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 261 Filed 01/10/12 Page 2 of 6 Page ID#: 2832

II. STIPULATED LEGAL ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED IN ADVANCE OF TRIAL

1. The parties stipulate and will not challenge that this Court, sitting in diversity,

applies the substantive state law of California and federal procedural law pursuant to Erie

Railroad Co. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64, 58 S. Ct. 817, 82 L. Ed. 1188 (1938).

2. The parties stipulate, agree and will not challenge that plaintiff's claim is limited

to the issue of whether the Robertshaw R110 control valve is design defective pursuant to

California's Risk-Benefit test. All claims of warnings, instructions, manufacturing defect, or

defect pursuant to the consumer expectation test have been dismissed.

3. The parties stipulate and agree that plaintiff will not pursue a claim of defect in

design based upon lack of a gas detector.

4. The parties stipulate and agree that plaintiff will not pursue claims for past wages,

future income loss and/or earning capacity impairment as Plaintiff has withdrawn these claims

pursuant to the Pretrial Order and requested amendment to the pleadings.

III. STIPULATED MOTIONS IN LIMINE

1. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

that Robertshaw failed to adequately inspect or test the R110 control valve will be presented at

trial.

2. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

that Robertshaw was negligent in the manufacture or inspection of the R110 control valve will be

presented at trial. The evidence will address the issue of the California Risk-Benefit test.

3. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

regarding claims of inadequate warnings by American Water Heater will be presented at trial.

MERRICK, HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW 3101 WESTERN AVE, SUITE 200 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 270 Filed 01/12/12 Page 3 of 5

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 261 Filed 01/10/12 Page 3 of 6 Page ID#: 2833

4. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

regarding claims of manufacturing defect associated with specific R110 control valve or

components will be presented at trial.

5. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

regarding claims of design defect in terms of the expectations of an ordinary consumer will be

presented at trial.

6. The parties stipulate and agree that all witnesses, including expert witnesses,

should be excluded and prohibited from otherwise hearing testimony of other witnesses at trial.

7. The parties stipulate and agree to disclose a witness schedule 24 hours in advance

of trial

8. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

regarding alleged financial burden on Plaintiff or Defendant or the financial condition of Plaintiff

or Defendant shall be presented at trial.

9. The parties stipulate and agree that no evidence or testimony (either lay or expert)

regarding settlement offers, demands, negotiations or discussions between Plaintiff and

Robertshaw shall be presented at trial.

10. The parties stipulate and agree that exhibits shall not be referenced or discussed

(including display to jury) prior to admission of said exhibit or with the Court's agreement of

counsel.

11. The parties stipulate and agree that only testimony (either lay or expert) or

evidence disclosed in disclosures, interrogatories, depositions and/or pretrial submissions will be

permitted at trial.

MERRICK, HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW 3101 WESTERN AVE, SUITE 200 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121 (206) 682-0610 Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 270 Filed 01/12/12 Page 4 of 5

12. The parties stipulate and agree that no testimony (either lay or expert) or evidence

of insurance, save for that allowed under applicable substantive California law, shall be

presented at trial.

13. The parties stipulate and agree that there will be no testimony (either lay or

expert) or evidence regarding the "golden rule" or asking jury to place themselves in position of

the Plaintiff or Defendant presented at trial.

14. The parties stipulate and agree that no testimony (either lay or expert) or evidence

regarding plaintiff's use of recreational drugs well before the incident will be presented at trial.

15. The parties stipulate and agree that no testimony (either lay or expert) or evidence

regarding plaintiff obtaining a medical marijuana card in seeking relief from the pain suffered

because of his burn injuries will be presented at trial.

16. The parties stipulate and agree that no testimony (either lay or expert) or evidence

regarding a criminal investigation into the conduct of Mike Bispo, plaintiff's brother, will be

presented at trial.

IV. PROPOSED ORDER

Having stipulated and agreed to the issues set forth in this Stipulation, the Parties request

that the Court enter an order regarding these matters.

MERRICK, HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW 3101 WESTERN AVE, SUITE 200 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121 (206) 682-0610

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 270 Filed 01/12/12 Page 5 of 5

Case 3:05-cv-01223-BR Document 261 Filed 01/10/12 Page 5 of 6 Page ID#: 2835

Jointly submitted this 10th day of January 2012.

PICKETT DUMMIGAN LLP

MERRICK HOFSTEDT & LINDSEY, P.S.

s/ J. Randolph Pickett J. Randolph Pickett, OSB #721974 R. Brendan Dummigan, OSB #93258 Kristen West, OSB #061380 PICKETT DUMMIGAN LLP

s/Thomas R. Merrick Thomas R. Merrick, WSBA #10945

of Attorneys for Defendant

Roger K. Evans, OSB #812170 LAW OFFICE OF ROGER K. EVANS

of Attorneys for Plaintiff

For Court Use Only

The foregoing Stipulation of Parties Regarding Joint Proposed Motion Schedule is:

Approved. V

G Approved as amended by interlineation.

SO ORDERED this // day of January, 2012.

United States District Judge